

Peter D. Conrad  
Member of the Firm  
d +1.212.969.3020  
f 212.969.2900  
pconrad@proskauer.com  
www.proskauer.com

April 24, 2020

**BY E-FILING**

Roxanne L. Rothschild, Esq.  
Executive Secretary  
National Labor Relations Board  
1015 Half Street, SE  
Washington, DC 20570

Re: MHN Government Services, LLC  
Case No. 19-RC-242915  
(Letter-Motion for Leave to File Reply  
to Petitioner's Opposition to a Stay)

Dear Ms. Rothschild:

As you know, we represent MHN Government Services, LLC in the matter identified above, in which our April 6, 2020 Request for Review of the Regional Director's March 9 Decision on Objections is pending before the Board. By this letter-motion, we seek leave to file a reply to Petitioner's opposition to our motion for a stay.

By letter dated April 17, we notified you that for the reasons discussed in our brief in support of review, we had made a complaint to the Office of the Inspector General earlier in the week concerning testimony of a Board agent at the December 19, 2019 election objections hearing. The nature of our complaint was such that were it found to be substantiated by the Inspector General, it could affect the outcome of the pending proceeding. Accordingly, we suggested that the Board stay its action on review until the OIG had an opportunity to consider and act on our complaint to avoid a need to reopen the proceeding at a later date.<sup>1</sup> On April 20, we were advised by your office that our letter would be deemed a motion to stay Board action in the representation case.

Not wishing to take any action that might be deemed to interfere with the OIG's work, we kept to a minimum our disclosures about the conduct in question, and referred to our brief in support of the Request for Review where our position is described at length. Our purpose was to put the Board on notice of the existence of the complaint and to

---

<sup>1</sup> Before doing so, we had asked the OIG to inform the Executive Secretary of the existence of the complaint so that the Board could defer action on the Request for Review. We were informed that it was not OIG procedure to do so. We also were advised, in response to our inquiry, that the OIG would take no position regarding, or provide and guidance with respect to, communications that we might have with the Board or other parties regarding the existence of the complaint.



Roxanne L. Rothschild, Esq.  
Executive Secretary  
National Labor Relations Board  
April 24, 2020  
Page 2

divulge only its essence -- not to argue it -- so that you would be aware of the potential impact that the complaint could have on the review process and consider the appropriateness of a stay.

On April 22, counsel for Petitioner submitted a lengthy opposition to any stay of Board action on the Request for Review, in which he challenged both the underlying premise for our complaint as well as the motivations behind it. In addition, counsel made an issue of my own conduct in connection with the OIG complaint, and has asked the General Counsel to review the matter pursuant to Section 102.177 of the Board's Rules and Regulations.

We hereby request an opportunity to reply to counsel's baseless accusations and arguments in opposition to the stay and in support of his unfounded request that the General Counsel consider the propriety of my own actions in reaching out to the Inspector General through proper channels on a matter of importance believed to be genuinely worthy of his investigation.

Respectfully submitted,

Proskauer Rose LLP

By: Peter D Conrad  
Peter D. Conrad

cc: Peter B. Robb, Esq.  
Beth Tursell, Esq.  
David P. Berry, Esq.  
James Tatum, Jr., Esq.  
Farah Qureshi, Esq.  
Alisa Jones, Esq.  
Valerie Hardy-Mahoney, Esq.  
Ronald K. Hooks, Esq.  
Richard C. Fiol, Esq.  
David Rosenfeld, Esq.  
David Fujimoto, Esq.